

Singlet-Assisted Supersymmetry Breaking For $SP(2N)$ Theories That S-ConfinesBin Zhu ^{a1} Kun Meng ^{b2} Ran Ding ^{a3} and Qiyi Li ^{a4}^a *School of Physics, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, China*^b *School of Science, Tianjin Polytechnic University***Abstract**

We analyze SUSY breaking vacua in s-confining theories with gauge group $Sp(2N)$. The recipe we adapt is to couple gauge singlets to gauge invariant composites yielding meta-stable vacua near origin. At low energies, the complicated gauge theory is reduced to simple O’Raifeartaigh model with relevant interactions. We manage to compute the effective potential and one-loop mass for the pseudomoduli. Our conclusion is that only the model with one anti-symmetric tensor and six flavors has local stable SUSY breaking vacua.

¹Binzhu7@gmail.com²kunmeng@mail.nankai.edu.cn³dingran@mail.nankai.edu.cn⁴liqiyi@mail.nankai.edu.cn

1 Introduction

We expect SUSY to be broken spontaneously in order to preserve its beautiful features. Any realistic SUSY-breaking model will encounter Supertrace problem. This constrains the structure of SUSY-breaking to be gauge (or gravity) mediated SUSY breaking. It mainly contains two aspects: build a model for the SUSY-breaking sector and mediate this to the MSSM. In this paper, we concentrate on the first one.

Dynamical SUSY breaking was first proposed by Witten[1][2] to solve the hierarchy problem between SUSY breaking scale and Plank scale. However, Witten index[3] and R-symmetry theorem[4] forbid general existence of supersymmetry breaking at stable vacuum. If we want to construct generic models, metastable SUSY breaking is inevitable. This scenario dates back to Eillis et.al[5], they construct a model with a classically metastable vacuum in 1982. [6], developed the first model which contains a small parameter characterizing the explicit R-symmetry breaking. The smallness of the parameter suppresses the possibility of tunnelling from metastable vacuum to true vacuum. In practice, however, this model suffers from the problem of non-calculability.

With the advent of ISS model[7], the problem of calculability can be solved due to Seiberg duality[8][9]. It also makes meta-stable SUSY breaking easy to achieve in various models[20]. It is natural to seek for local minima in other types of gauge theories instead of global one. Recently, there is a revival[10][11][12][13][14] for looking for local minima in S-confining theories. S-confining theories[15][16] are well understood,

1. All degrees of freedom in IR are gauge invariant composites.
2. It admits a smooth effective theory in terms of gauge invariant composites all over the moduli space including the origin of field space
3. Dynamical superpotential is generated to specify constraints for gauge invariant composites.

N=1 SU(N) s-confining theories for Dynamical SUSY breaking have already been discussed in detail in[10] and [12], especially on theory 2, 6, 7, 8.⁵

The basic recipe[12] we adapt is to couple singlets S_i to each gauge invariant composites X_i except one.

$$\delta W = S_i X_i + f X \tag{1}$$

Here we mention that X_i are made up of matter content whose mass dimension are not 1. The construction of gauge invariant composites from matter belongs to the Hilbert series problem, which can be found in the recent development[17][18][19]. The corresponding Kahler potential is not conventionally canonical.

$$K = \frac{1}{|\Lambda|^{2d_i-2}} X_i X_i^+ \tag{2}$$

⁵see table 1

Theory 1	$SU(N)$	$(N+1)(\square + \bar{\square})$
Theory 2	$SU(2N)$	$\square + 2N\bar{\square} + 4\square$
Theory 3	$SU(2N+1)$	$\square + (2N+1)\bar{\square} + 4\square$
Theory 4	$SU(2N+1)$	$\square + \bar{\square} + 3(\square + \bar{\square})$
Theory 5	$SU(2N)$	$\square + \bar{\square} + 3(\square + \bar{\square})$
Theory 6	$SU(6)$	$\square + 4(\square + \bar{\square})$
Theory 7	$SU(5)$	$3(\square + \bar{\square})$
Theory 8	$SU(5)$	$2\square + 2\square + 4\bar{\square}$
Theory 9	$SU(6)$	$2\square + 5\bar{\square} + \square$
Theory 10	$SU(7)$	$2(\square + 3\bar{\square})$

Table 1: s-confining $SU(N)$ theories.

where d_i is the mass dimension of X_i and repeated indices mean summation. In order to derive the canonical Kahler potential, we rescale X_i in the following way

$$X_i \rightarrow \Lambda^{d_i-1} X_i \quad (3)$$

We can distinguish relevant terms from irrelevant terms once get canonical Kahler potential. Terms with $\frac{1}{\Lambda^n}$ can be ignored safely at lower energies. Usually, there is a classical flat direction associated with SUSY breaking which is called pseudomoduli space. At one-loop order the pseudomoduli are lifted by the Coleman-Weinberg potential. We have to compute the one-loop mass in order to testify whether or not the SUSY breaking is stable. Gauge mediation needs large global group which serves gauge interactions for MSSM. That makes the computation of Coleman-Weinberg potential[21] very difficult for the number of fields growing large.

$$V_{eff} = \frac{1}{64\pi^2} STr \left(M^4 \log \frac{M^2}{\Lambda^2} \right) \quad (4)$$

Multiple diagonalization of large matrix is too complicated to compute even for symbolic software such as Mathematica. With the invent of Vscape[22], we can compute Coleman-Weinberg potential numerically. It allows us to compare the schematic result with the numerical one and justify the stability and calculability. In this paper, We analyze SUSY breaking vacua in s-confining theories with gauge group $Sp(2N)$. The recipe we have used above can create isolated minima near the the origin of field space, and the stability of this SUSY breaking scenario can be confirmed by either Vscape or schematic calculation.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we study $Sp(2N)$ with $2N+4$ fundamental flavors theories, $Sp(2N)$ with 1 anti-symmetric tensor and 6 fundamental flavors. In this section, we classify the possible ways of linear perturbation fX . Canonical coupling is defined to be coupled to X with lowest mass dimension. Other types of perturbations are defined to be

twisted coupling. Canonical coupling has a straightforward pseudomoduli space which is easy to derive by Grobner Basis. For twisted coupling, pseudomoduli is parametrized by a polynomial equation rather than a complex coordinate. We leave this case in the accompanied paper. In section 3, we will draw the conclusions and discuss some open questions.

2 S-Confining Theories and Dynamical SUSY Breaking

S-confining theories must satisfy two criterions proved by Csaki et, al[15]. One is the Dynkin index relation

$$\sum_j \mu_j - \mu_G = 2 \quad (5)$$

which rules out most theories immediately. The other condition is that the original theory can not be s-confining with reduced theory involving degrees of freedom more than gauge invariant composites. We now discuss s-confining theories with gauge group $Sp(2N)$. We summarize the all gauge group and field content satisfying the relation 5 into a table.

$Sp(2N)$	$2N + 4\Box$	S-confining
$Sp(2N)$	$\Box + 6\Box$	S-confining
$Sp(2N)$	$\Box\Box + 2\Box$	Coulomb branch
$Sp(4)$	$2\Box + 4\Box$	$SU(2) : 8\Box$
$Sp(4)$	$3\Box + 2\Box$	$SU(2) : \Box + 4\Box$
$Sp(4)$	$4\Box$	$SU(2) : \Box + 4\Box$
$Sp(6)$	$2\Box + 2\Box$	$Sp(4) : 2\Box + 4\Box$
$Sp(6)$	$\Box + 5\Box$	$Sp(4) : 2\Box\Box + 4\Box$
$Sp(6)$	$\Box + \Box + \Box$	$SU(2) : \Box\Box + 4\Box$
$Sp(6)$	$2\Box$	$SU(3) : \Box + \bar{\Box}$
$Sp(8)$	$2\Box$	$Sp(4) : 5\Box$

From the table, we find only the first two theories are s-confining, the others flow to non-confining theories.

2.1 $Sp(2N)$ with $2N + 4$ fundamental flavors

This theory[23] has gauge group $Sp(2N)$ and $2N + 4$ fundamental flavors matter content. When $W = 0$, theory has an anomaly-free $SU(2N + 4) \times U(1)_R$ global symmetry with charges given in Table 1.

	$Sp(2N)$	$SU(2N + 4)$	$U(1)_R$
Q	$\Box$	$\Box$	$\frac{1}{N+2}$
$X = Q^2$	1	$\Box$	$\frac{1}{N+2}$

In the strongly coupled IR regime, theory admits a weakly coupled S-confining description in terms of gauge invariant composite $X = Q^2$. The dynamically generated superpotential is

$$W_{\text{dyn}} = \frac{1}{\Lambda^{2N+1}} X^{N+2} \quad (6)$$

The gauge invariant X has mass dimension 2. After rescale X to ΛX , superpotential becomes

$$W = \Lambda^{1-N} X^{N+2} \quad (7)$$

Since there is only one gauge invariant composite, canonical coupling is

$$\delta W = h \Lambda^2 X \quad (8)$$

And the total superpotential is

$$W = fX + \Lambda^{1-N} X^{N+2} \quad (9)$$

where we have defined $f = h\Lambda^2$.

We note that when $N > 1$, the relevant term is only fX , SUSY is spontaneously broken by the F-term of X . However, there is no relevant interaction for X . That means there is no one-loop correction for the pseudomoduli X . Compared with this vanishing calculable corrections, non-calculable corrections dominate, which belongs to non-calculable SUSY breaking scenario. On the other hand, when $N=1$, the gauge group is $Sp(2)$, F-term has solutions and SUSY is not broken.

2.2 $Sp(2N)$ with 1 anti-symmetric tensor and 6 fundamental flavors

This theory[24] has gauge group $Sp(2N)$ with 1 anti-symmetric tensor and 6 fundamental flavors. When $W = 0$, theory has anomaly-free $SU(6) \times U(1) \times U(1)_R$ global symmetry, with the charges listed in the Table.

	$Sp(2N)$	$SU(6)$	$U(1)$	$U(1)_R$
A	$\square$	1	-3	0
Q	$\square$	$\square$	N-1	$\frac{1}{3}$
$T_k = A^k$	1	1	-3k	0
$M_m = QA^mQ$	1	$\square$	2(N-1)-3k	$\frac{1}{3}$

The confined spectra is

$$T_k = A^k \quad (10)$$

$$M_m = QA^mQ \quad (11)$$

where $k = 2, \dots, N$, $m = 1, \dots, N-1$

2.2.1 $Sp(4)$

We first consider the simplest one at $N = 2$

$$T_2 = A^2 \quad (12)$$

$$M_0 = Q^2 \quad (13)$$

$$M_1 = QAQ \quad (14)$$

Where the mass dimension of T_2 , M_0 and M_1 are 2, 2, and 3 respectively. The intriguing feature is that gauge invariant composites are either flavor singlets or flavor anti-symmetric tensor which makes calculation simple. The dynamically generated superpotential is

$$W_d = \frac{1}{\Lambda^5} \left(\frac{1}{3} T_2 M_0^3 + \frac{1}{2} M_0 M_1^2 \right) \quad (15)$$

After rescale superfields by $T_2 \rightarrow \Lambda T_2, M_0 \rightarrow \Lambda M_0, M_1 \rightarrow \Lambda^2 M_1$, the relevant dynamical superpotential is

$$W_d = \frac{1}{2} M_0 M_1^2 \quad (16)$$

There are only two types of couplings we can take after adding singlets to break SUSY,

$$\delta W = f M_0 + m_1 S_1 M_1 + m_2 S_2 T_2 \quad (17)$$

$$\delta W = f M_1 + m_0 S_0 M_0 + m_2 S_2 T_2 \quad (18)$$

In the above equations, $T_2 S_2$ are set to zero by solving corresponding F-terms when we look for minimal energy configuration. It implies that we can safely drop terms $S_i X_i$ which do not appear in the relevant W_d . We call equation (17) canonical coupling, the other one is called twisted coupling. Take canonical coupling into consideration at first. Therefore the entire superpotential is $W = f M_0 + m_1 S_1 M_1 + \frac{1}{2} M_0 M_1^2$ with the component form

$$W = f^{ab} M_{0ab} + m_1 S_1^{ab} M_{1ab} + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{abcdef} M_{0ab} M_{1cd} M_{1ef} \quad (19)$$

It is easy to see that SUSY is broken by using GroebnerBasis package in Mathematica. By setting f to zero, we get to know that the dangerous pseudomoduli is M_0 . We use Vscape to compute Coleman-Weinberg potential numerically and prove the one-loop mass is positive.

We can also take a schematic way to deal with this model by freezing the flavor components. Once we do that, it will reduce to basic O’Raifeartaigh model. The interesting point is that it mimic the complicated model in high accuracy compared with Vscape output. The parameters appearing in the model can be classified to two branches.

1. Since m has naturally small parameter $\varepsilon = \frac{\Lambda}{M_{UV}}$. If $m > f$, we have to tune f small enough compared with m by hand, then the theory is reduced to basic OR model with plenty of flavor components. The schematic calculation⁶ shows one-loop mass for M_0 is approximated to $\frac{1}{16\pi^2} f$. So supersymmetry breaking is stable. The ratio between non-calculable and calculable correction is $\frac{f}{\Lambda^2} \ll 1$. So the supersymmetry breaking is calculable.
2. If $m \ll f$, supersymmetry breaking is badly large, there is something interesting happened. However, since we are only interested in whether or not supersymmetry breaking is stable and calculable. The schematic result (freeze the flavor component) shows $m^2 \sim \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \frac{m^2}{f}$. That means susy breaking is stable. The ratio is proportional to ε , which is naturally small implying supersymmetry breaking is calculable.

Move far away from the origin of field space, irrelevant interactions become more and more important. SUSY vacuums may or may not appear due to irrelevant interactions. However, there is no need for such vacuum existing. Because what we are interested is only meta-stable SUSY breaking. The meta-stability is guaranteed by the small ratio of $\frac{f}{m^2}$. Turn to twisted coupling, pseudomoduli is parameterized by a polynomial equation rather than a single coordinate.

$$2mS^{ab} + \varepsilon^{abcd} f X_{cd} X_{ef} = 0 \quad (20)$$

The computation for Coleman-Weinberg is involved into ambiguity on which one is pseudomoduli. We leave this issue into subsequent paper.

2.3 $Sp(6)$

$Sp(6)$ has more gauge invariant composites.

$$\begin{aligned} T_2 &= A^2 \\ T_3 &= A^3 \\ M_0 &= Q^2 \\ M_1 &= QAQ \\ M_2 &= QA^2Q \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

The dynamically generated superpotential is

$$W_d = \frac{1}{\Lambda^7} \left(\frac{1}{3} T_2^2 M_0^3 + \frac{1}{2} T_3 M_1 M_0^2 - \frac{1}{2} T_2 M_0^2 M_2 + \frac{1}{4} M_0 M_2^2 + \frac{1}{4} M_1^2 M_2 \right) \quad (22)$$

After rescaling and coupling singlets to gauge invariant composites canonically.

$$W = \frac{1}{4} M_1^2 M_2 + \frac{1}{4} M_0 M_2^2 + f M_0 + m_1 S_1 M_1 + m_2 S_2 M_2 \quad (23)$$

We apply the same procedure to $Sp(6)$ as $Sp(4)$. SUSY is broken again by the F-term of M_0 . The parameter f can be tuned to be much smaller than $M_1 M_2$, then the conclusion of SUSY

⁶Assume gauge invariant composites are flavor singlets

breaking for $Sp(4)$. A simple conjecture about higher rank $Sp(2N)$ that all of them break SUSY spontaneously by the lowest dimension perturbation fM_0 and creat the isolated local minima in the origin.

3 Conclusion

We use the simple recipe proposed by Shadmi and shirman to obtain local SUSY-breaking minima in s-confining theories with gauge group $Sp(2N)$. The theory can be classified into two simple types, $Sp(2N)$ with $2N + 4$ fundamental flavors does not give rise to effective O’Raifeartaigh model in the IR thus does not break SUSY, $Sp(2N)$ with 1 anti-symmetric tensor and 6 fundamental flavors can generate local non-supersymmetric minima which is a long-lived meta-stable vacuum.

Pseudomoduli depends on what types of perturbation we choose. Canonical coupling can break SUSY easily and generalize to arbitrary rank of $Sp(2N)$.

Appendix

In order to determine whether or not SUSY is broken and what the pseudomoduli is, we need to resort to component form of superpotential. At the first glance, there is a very complicated term $\epsilon^{abcd}fM_{0ab}M_{1cd}M_{1ef}$. However, Mathematica can deal with it very well. Here we redefine $M_0 \rightarrow M$, $M_1 \rightarrow X$, then we can get the explicit form of this term

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^{abcd}fM_{ab}X_{cd}X_{ef} = & 16M_{56}X_{14}X_{23} - 16M_{46}X_{15}X_{23} + 16M_{45}X_{16}X_{23} \\ & + 16M_{16}X_{45}X_{23} - 16M_{15}X_{46}X_{23} + 16M_{14}X_{56}X_{23} \\ & - 16M_{56}X_{13}X_{24} + 16M_{36}X_{15}X_{24} - 16M_{35}X_{16}X_{24} \\ & + 16M_{46}X_{13}X_{25} - 16M_{36}X_{14}X_{25} + 16M_{34}X_{16}X_{25} \\ & - 16M_{45}X_{13}X_{26} + 16M_{35}X_{14}X_{26} - 16M_{34}X_{15}X_{26} \\ & + 16M_{56}X_{12}X_{34} - 16M_{26}X_{15}X_{34} + 16M_{25}X_{16}X_{34} \\ & + 16M_{16}X_{25}X_{34} - 16M_{15}X_{26}X_{34} - 16M_{46}X_{12}X_{35} \\ & + 16M_{26}X_{14}X_{35} - 16M_{24}X_{16}X_{35} - 16M_{16}X_{24}X_{35} \\ & + 16M_{14}X_{26}X_{35} + 16M_{45}X_{12}X_{36} - 16M_{25}X_{14}X_{36} \\ & + 16M_{24}X_{15}X_{36} + 16M_{15}X_{24}X_{36} - 16M_{14}X_{25}X_{36} \\ & + 16M_{36}X_{12}X_{45} - 16M_{26}X_{13}X_{45} + 16M_{23}X_{16}X_{45} \\ & - 16M_{13}X_{26}X_{45} + 16M_{12}X_{36}X_{45} - 16M_{35}X_{12}X_{46} \\ & + 16M_{25}X_{13}X_{46} - 16M_{23}X_{15}X_{46} + 16M_{13}X_{25}X_{46} \\ & - 16M_{12}X_{35}X_{46} + 16M_{34}X_{12}X_{56} - 16M_{24}X_{13}X_{56} \\ & + 16M_{23}X_{14}X_{56} - 16M_{13}X_{24}X_{56} + 16M_{12}X_{34}X_{56} \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

References

- [1] E. Witten, “Mass Hierarchies in Supersymmetric Theories,” *Phys. Lett. B* **105** (1981) 267.
- [2] E. Witten, “Dynamical Breaking of Supersymmetry,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **188** (1981) 513.
- [3] E. Witten, “Constraints on Supersymmetry Breaking,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **202** (1982) 253.
- [4] A. E. Nelson and N. Seiberg, “R symmetry breaking versus supersymmetry breaking,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **416** (1994) 46 [hep-ph/9309299].
- [5] J. R. Ellis, C. H. Llewellyn Smith and G. G. Ross, “Will The Universe Become Supersymmetric?,” *Phys. Lett. B* **114** (1982) 227.
- [6] S. Dimopoulos, G. R. Dvali, R. Rattazzi and G. F. Giudice, “Dynamical soft terms with unbroken supersymmetry,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **510** (1998) 12 [hep-ph/9705307].
- [7] K. A. Intriligator, N. Seiberg and D. Shih, “Dynamical SUSY breaking in meta-stable vacua,” *JHEP* **0604** (2006) 021 [hep-th/0602239].
- [8] N. Seiberg, “Electric - magnetic duality in supersymmetric nonAbelian gauge theories,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **435** (1995) 129 [hep-th/9411149].
- [9] K. A. Intriligator and N. Seiberg, “Lectures on supersymmetric gauge theories and electric - magnetic duality,” *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **45BC** (1996) 1 [hep-th/9509066].
- [10] T. Lin, J. D. Mason and A. Sajjad, “Hunting for Dynamical Supersymmetry Breaking in Theories That S-confine,” *JHEP* **1108** (2011) 145 [arXiv:1107.2658 [hep-th]].
- [11] Y. Shadmi, “Metastable Rank-Condition Supersymmetry Breaking in a Chiral Example,” *JHEP* **1108** (2011) 149 [arXiv:1107.3565 [hep-th]].
- [12] Y. Shadmi and Y. Shirman, “Singlet Assisted Supersymmetry Breaking,” *JHEP* **1201** (2012) 087 [arXiv:1110.2489 [hep-th]].
- [13] M. Bertolini, L. Di Pietro and F. Porri, “Dynamical completions of generalized O’Raifeartaigh models,” *JHEP* **1201** (2012) 158 [arXiv:1111.2307 [hep-th]].
- [14] N. Maru, “A Chiral Model of Metastable SUSY Breaking via Chiral/Nonchiral Seiberg Duality,” arXiv:1111.4720 [hep-th].
- [15] C. Csaki, M. Schmaltz and W. Skiba, “Confinement in N=1 SUSY gauge theories and model building tools,” *Phys. Rev. D* **55** (1997) 7840 [hep-th/9612207].
- [16] C. Csaki, “The Confining N=1 supersymmetric gauge theories: A Review,” hep-th/9807222.

- [17] Y. -H. He, “Vacuum Geometry and the Search for New Physics,” eConf C **0706044** (2007) 04.
- [18] D. Forcella, A. Hanany, Y. -H. He and A. Zaffaroni, “The Master Space of $N=1$ Gauge Theories,” JHEP **0808** (2008) 012 [arXiv:0801.1585 [hep-th]].
- [19] J. Gray, A. Hanany, Y. -H. He, V. Jejjala and N. Mekareeya, “SQCD: A Geometric Apercu,” JHEP **0805** (2008) 099 [arXiv:0803.4257 [hep-th]].
- [20] Some properties of meta-stable supersymmetry-breaking vacua in Wess-Zumino models - Ray, Sebastien Phys.Lett. B642 (2006) 137-141 hep-th/0607172 LPTENS-06-29
 Dynamical SUSY breaking at meta-stable minima from D-branes at obstructed geometries - Franco, Sebastian et al. JHEP 0606 (2006) 031 hep-th/0604136 CQRN-PH-TH-2006-060, IFT-UAM-CSIC-06-17, PUPT-2195
 Dynamical GUT breaking and mu-term driven supersymmetry breaking - Kitano, Ryuichiro Phys.Rev. D74 (2006) 115002 hep-ph/0606129 SLAC-PUB-11897
 Landscape of supersymmetry breaking vacua in geometrically realized gauge theories - Ooguri, Hiroshi et al. Nucl.Phys. B755 (2006) 239-253 hep-th/0606061 CALT-68-2602
 Gravitational Gauge Mediation - Kitano, Ryuichiro Phys.Lett. B641 (2006) 203-207 hep-ph/0607090 SLAC-PUB-11953
 Non-supersymmetric meta-stable vacua in $SU(N)$ SQCD with adjoint matter - Amariti, A. et al. JHEP 0612 (2006) 058 hep-th/0608063
- [21] S. R. Coleman and E. J. Weinberg, “Radiative Corrections as the Origin of Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking,” Phys. Rev. D **7** (1973) 1888.
- [22] K. van den Broek, “An Interactive tool for metastable vacua,” Comput. Phys. Commun. **178** (2008) 52 [arXiv:0705.2019 [hep-ph]].
- [23] K. A. Intriligator and P. Pouliot, “Exact superpotentials, quantum vacua and duality in supersymmetric $SP(N(c))$ gauge theories,” Phys. Lett. B **353** (1995) 471 [hep-th/9505006].
- [24] C. Csaki, W. Skiba and M. Schmaltz, “Exact results and duality for $SP(2N)$ SUSY gauge theories with an antisymmetric tensor,” Nucl. Phys. B **487** (1997) 128 [hep-th/9607210].